## Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KAREN ALBERTS,

Plaintiff,

v.

LIBERTY LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY OF BOSTON.

Defendant.

Case No. 14-cv-01587-RS (MEJ)

## **DISCOVERY ORDER**

Re: Dkt. No. 29

The Court is in receipt of the parties' joint letter regarding subpoenas that Defendant Liberty Life Assurance Company of Boston issued to the Human Resources Office for U.C. Berkeley, U.C. Office of the President, Stubbs & Leone, P.C., and Holmes & Usoz LLP. Dkt. No. 29. These subpeonas seek records concerning Plaintiff's employment at the University of California ("U.C."), where she worked at the U.C. Berkeley Police Department between December 1987 and March 2011. Plaintiff objects to these subpoenas to the extent that they seek "records of disciplinary actions," "records of any security or law enforcement agency or department," "performance reviews," or any other documents relating to any disciplinary actions or any internal investigations conducted by U.C. concerning her. Jt. Ltr. at 1. Plaintiff agrees that U.C., Stubbs & Leone, P.C., and Holmes & Usoz LLP may produce all other documents responsive to these subpoenas. Id.

Liberty maintains that Plaintiff has waived all objections to the subpoena to U.C. Berkeley, and has articulated no reason for the Court to conduct an in camera review of any documents responsive to Liberty's subpoenas. Id. Liberty argues that Plaintiff's personnel records are relevant to the parties' claims and defenses, and are reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Id.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Upon review of the parties' positions, the Court ORDERS as follows:

- 1) Plaintiff's request for a protective order is DENIED, except as to any claim of privilege. For any such claim, a privilege log shall be provided in compliance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(5) within seven days. The privilege log must be sufficiently detailed and informative to justify the privilege. With respect to each communication for which a claim of privilege or work product is made, the party must identify: (a) all persons making or receiving the privileged or protected communication; (b) the steps taken to ensure the confidentiality of the communication, including affirmation that no unauthorized persons have received the communication; (c) the date of the communication; and (d) the subject matter of the communication.
- 2) If Liberty disputes that any privilege applies, the parties shall meet and confer in compliance with the undersigned's Discovery Standing Order. If it is necessary for the parties to file a joint letter, Plaintiff will lodge with the undersigned's chambers (not file) the disputed documents for the Court's review.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 16, 2014

MARIA-ELENA JAMES United States Magistrate Judge